

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 4 and 7 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by US Weimer Patent 2,334,460. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Thomas Beach for graciously granting a brief telephonic interview on April 13, 2006 wherein he further explained his basis for the rejection. Specifically, he explained that if the two hoist trunnions 14 are taken together, and if the sides of the bucket, as shown in Figure 2, are regarded as part of the base of the bucket, then the two hoist trunnions 14 are midway between the edges of the bucket. Examiner Thomas Beach also explained that Claim 4, being directed to only rigging, lacked sufficient structure to define over the link 16 of Weimer.

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 7, as amended, define, in part, a bucket including a base, two spaced apart side walls and one central hoist trunnion attached to the base midway between the side walls.

None of the references teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, such a bucket. More particularly, the bucket of Weimer does not have a central hoist trunnion attached to the bucket base midway between the side walls of the bucket. More specifically, although two spaced apart hoist trunnions are connected to the base midway between the edges of the bucket, this is not the claimed structure of a single central hoist trunnion attached to the bucket base midway between the side walls of the bucket. In fact, there is no single (a) hoist trunnion connected midway between the sides of the bucket in Weimer.

Still more specifically, as explained in the specification, the purpose of Applicant's invention is to reduce the over weight of bucket rigging over the prior art. The use of the

single hoist trunnion and the single hoist rope constitutes a patentable improvement over Weimer.

Accordingly, the allowance of Claims 1, 2, 3 and 7 are requested.

Further, Claims 1, 2 and 3 further define the bucket and rigging assembly as including one hoist chain coupled to the central hoist trunnion. None of the references teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, such a bucket and rigging assembly. More particularly, the bucket of Weimer does not have one hoist chain coupled to a central hoist trunnion attached to a bucket base midway between bucket side walls. Weimer teaches two hoist ropes connected to two spaced apart hoist trunnions, not one rope connected to one central hoist trunnion attached to the bucket base between the sides of the bucket. For this further reason, the allowance of Claims 1, 2, and 3 are requested.

Further, Claim 4, as now defined, defines, in part, a bucket and rigging assembly including spaced apart first and second hoist sockets, a hoist chain attached to a bucket, a link including a two ends and a central section, means for pivotally attaching the first hoist socket to one link end and means for pivotally attaching the second hoist socket to the other link end, and means for pivotally attaching the hoist chain to the link central section. None of the references teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, such a bucket rigging assembly. More particularly, the bucket rigging assembly of Weimer does not include means for pivotally attaching a hoist chain, adapted to be attached to a bucket, to a link central section. In fact, Weimer teaches connected two spaced apart hoist ropes to two spaced apart hoist trunnions. Accordingly, the allowance of Claim 4 is requested.

The issuance of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

19 May 2006

Date: _____

James Earl Lowe, Jr.

James Earl Lowe, Jr.
Registration No. 30402
15417 W. National Ave. #300
New Berlin, WI 53151
414-4270298
Customer No. 006123